		1	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
3		X	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	: CR 03-1382(S-1)	
5		:	
6			
7	-against-	: United States Courthouse	
8	VITO RIZZUTO,	Brooklyn, New York :	
9	Da Carada A	May 4, 2007	
10	Defendant.	: 11:00 o'clock a.m.	
11		X	
12	TRANSCRIPT OF PLEADING		
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
14			
15	APPEARANCES:		
16	For the Covernment	ROSLYNN R. MAUSKOPF United States Attorney	
17		BY: GREGORY ANDRES	
18		Assistant United States Attorney One Pierrepont Plaza	
19		Brooklyn, New York	
20	Fér the Defendant:	JOHN MITCHELL, ESQ.	
21	Court Reporter:	Gene Rudolph	
22	Court Reporter.	225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York	
23		(718) 613-2538	
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript		
25	produced by computer-aided transcription.		

2 1 THE CLERK: United States versus Rizzuto. 2 (Counsel present; appearances noted.) 3 THE COURT: Good morning. 4 Mr. Mitchell, I understand that your client wishes to withdraw his previously entered plea of not guilty to Count 5 6 One of the indictment and to enter a plea of guilty to that 7 count pursuant to a plea agreement. 8 MR. MITCHELL: That is correct, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Very well. 10 MR. ANDRES: Your Honor, before we get 11 started -- I'm sorry to interrupt already. 12 Just one novelty, if you will. 13 THE COURT: A what? 14 MR. ANDRES: A novelty about this plea or -- it's certainly not the standard practice of the office to offer a 15 16 plea under these terms so I just wanted to make that clear to 17 Your Honor because one part of the plea requires that Your 18 Honor accept the plea, and once you do, it binds all the 19 If Your Honor chooses not to accept the plea, unlike parties. 20 other cases, it wouldn't bind all of the parties. 21 What I am specifically referring to is 22 Rule 11(c)(1)(C) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, 23 so I just wanted to make that clear to Your Honor. And to the extent that Your Honor is in a position 24 25 to inform the parties as to whether or not the Court would be

prepared to accept the plea, provided the allocution is sufficient, I think that's something that might be helpful going forward so that we don't prejudice the defendant in any way, or were the Court not to decide to take the plea.

THE COURT: In other words, we wouldn't want to go through a procedure that was not going to result in the desired outcome.

MR. ANDRES: Correct. Namely, require the defendant to allocute to crimes that Your Honor wouldn't later accept the plea.

The rule itself requires -- says that if there is an agreement that a specific sentence or sentencing range is the appropriate disposition of the case, or that a particular provision of the Sentencing Guidelines, or policy statement, or sentencing factor is or does not apply, such a recommendation or request binds the Court once the Court accepts the plea.

In the case of Mr. Rizzuto, the agreed upon sentence is a sentence of ten years of imprisonment, and the other terms with respect to fine or whether those terms are defined or not are all articulated in the plea agreement.

One thing just to inform the Court, with respect to the proposed sentence of ten years, whereas in most cases in a RICO murder or murder that's charged as a predicate act in a RICO would require a life sentence, that's not true in this

case because of the dates. That is to say, that because the predicate acts and the murders in this case took place in 1981, the statutory maximum sentence that Mr. Rizzuto could receive if convicted after trial would be 20 years and not life because the RICO law was not amended until the early nineties which allowed for that -- for it to be 20 years or life if the underlying predicate acts carried a term of 20 years.

So in defining whether or not ten years is reasonable for these crimes, it's certainly something that the government takes into consideration what the maximum sentence would be, and in this case that's 20 years and not life.

There are other reasons to support the plea which I am happy to put on the record once the -- once we get to that stage, Your Honor.

MR. MITCHELL: I also would make the observation that he was extradited pursuant to an extradition request which capped the punishment at 20 years. So it would be 20 years for both of those reasons.

THE COURT: I understand.

What about the question of the victims' families? Have they been consulted about this?

MR. ANDRES: Your Honor, as Your Honor knows, these -- these cases, not this case in particular but certainly the cases relating to the murder of three captains

CSR

has been going on for sometime. Clearly, it was something that was charged and tried during the Basciano trial. We were in contact with the family members during that trial and the family members have been notified of today's proceedings and notified of the terms.

Whether they are actually given the opportunity to veto or comment directly, our obligation is primarily to inform them of the proceedings, and they have been notified and my understanding is that they would like to -- we made attempts -- we contacted the Giaccone family. We were unable to get -- contact all of the Trincheras, but we will certainly do that for the purposes of -- we made attempts to and we certainly will do that for the purposes of sentencing. They will have a right to speak at sentencing.

THE COURT: Well, I have reviewed the plea agreement. I understand the terms of the agreement.

Subject to hearing the allocution of the defendant, it is my intention, although I can't guarantee it at this moment, that I will accept the plea. But it is certainly my expectation that I will accept the defendant's plea of guilty pursuant to the terms of this plea agreement.

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I believe I understand the reasons why this arrangement has been made, and I think that it is a prudent course of action for the parties and for the Court; of

course, subject to hearing from the defendant at the time of his allocution.

All right.

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Rizzuto, your attorney advises that you wish to plead guilty to Count One of the indictment in which you are charged. This is a serious decision. I must be certain that you make it understanding your rights and the consequences of your plea. I am going to explain certain rights to you and then ask you questions. I want your answers to be under oath. The deputy clerk will swear you in.

(The defendant duly sworn.)

THE COURT: Mr. Rizzuto, you understand that having been sworn to tell the truth, you must do so. If you were to deliberately lie in response to any question that I ask you, you could face further criminal charges for perjury.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If I say anything that you do not understand, or if you need me to repeat anything, you have only to ask. It is important that you understand everything that goes on in these proceedings.

Is that clear?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

	7	
1	THE COURT: Mr. Rizzuto, how old are you?	
2	THE DEFENDANT: Sixty-one, Your Honor.	
3	THE COURT: How far did you get with your education?	
4	THE DEFENDANT: Ninth grade.	
5	THE COURT: Where did you go to school?	
6	THE DEFENDANT: I went to Catholic school in Canada.	
7	THE COURT: Catholic school in Canada?	
8	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.	
9	THE COURT: Where in Canada?	
10	THE DEFENDANT: Montreal.	
11	THE COURT: Are you a Canadian citizen?	
12	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.	
13	THE COURT: Is English your primary language?	
14	THE DEFENDANT: I would say so, yes.	
15	THE COURT: What other languages do you speak?	
16	THE DEFENDANT: I speak four languages; Spanish,	
17	Italian, French.	
18	THE COURT: Have you had any difficulty in	
19	communicating with your client in English, Mr. Mitchell?	
20	MR. MITCHELL: None whatsoever, Your Honor.	
21	THE COURT: Very well.	
22	Mr. Rizzuto, I must be certain that whatever	
23	decision you make today you make with a clear head. So I am	
24	going to ask you some questions about your health.	
25	Are you currently, or have you recently, been under	

```
8
 1
    the care of a doctor or psychiatrist for any reason?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Doctor, yes.
 3
               THE COURT: For what?
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: They said they found a spot in my
 5
    lungs but they haven't said what's up to now yet.
 6
               THE COURT: Have you been --
 7
               THE DEFENDANT: They have to give me a CAT scan but
 8
    they say they will bring me to the hospital but they haven't
 9
    yet.
               THE COURT: When did they --
10
11
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Two months ago.
12
               THE COURT: How long?
13
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Two months.
14
               THE COURT: We will deal with that.
15
               MR. ANDRES:
                           Absolutely, Judge.
16
               THE COURT:
                           In the past 24 hours, have you taken any
17
    pills or drugs or medicine of any kind?
18
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               No, Your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: In the past 24 hours, have you drunk any
20
    alcoholic beverages?
21
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               No, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT:
                           Have you ever been hospitalized or
23
    treated for any drug related problem?
24
               THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: Is your mind clear as you stand here
```

GR

OCR

CM

CRR

CSR

9 1 today? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Do you understand everything being said 4 to you? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mitchell, have you 6 7 discussed the question of a guilty plea with your client? 8 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir. 9 THE COURT: In your view, does he understand the 10 rights that he would be waiving by pleading guilty? 11 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: Do you have any question as to your 13 client's competence to proceed today? 14 MR. MITCHELL: No. sir. THE COURT: Are you retained? 15 16 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Rizzuto, are you satisfied with the 18 assistance that your attorney has given you thus far in this 19 matter? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. sir. 21 THE COURT: Is there any reason why you might want 22 to have any further discussions with him before proceeding? 23 THE DEFENDANT: No reason. 24 THE COURT: Okay. You are pleading guilty to 25 Count One of the indictment in which you are charged in

03 CR 1384(S-1). I am going to ask Mr. Andres to state the charge in Count One and to identify the elements of the crime that the government would be required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt to a unanimous jury if you were to go to trial in this case.

Mr. Andres?

MR. ANDRES: Your Honor, the defendant is charged with racketeering conspiracy, pursuant to Title 18, Title 18 United States Code Section 1962, specifically Section D. The elements that the government would have to prove with respect to the racketeering conspiracy are:

First, that there is an enterprise, namely, the enterprise or association in fact that's alleged in the indictment, the government would have to prove that in fact existed.

Secondly, that there was an interstate commerce, that is to say, that the enterprise affected interstate or foreign commerce.

Third, that the defendant was associated with or employed by that enterprise; in this case, conspired with the enterprise.

And fourth, that the defendant knowingly and intentionally agreed that either he or other employees or associates of the enterprise would commit a pattern of racketeering activity.

With respect to this indictment and this plea, the pattern of racketeering activity is defined by the racketeering acts to which the defendant is going to plead and those are Racketeering Acts 5-A, which is the conspiracy to murder Alphonse Sonny Red Indelicato, Philip Phil Lucky Giaccone, Dominick Big Trin Trinchera; 5-B, which is the murder of Alphonse Sonny Red Indelicato; Racketeering Act 6, which is the murder of Philip Phil Lucky Giaccone; and Racketeering Act 7, which is the murder of Dominick Trinchera, Big Trin.

Those particular crimes are charged under the provisions of New York State law for both murder and murder conspiracy. New York Penal Law Section 20.00 provides in relevant part, that:

When a person engages in conduct which constitutes an offense, another person is criminally liable for such offense when, acting with the mental culpability required for the commission thereof, he solicits, requests, commands, importunes, or intentionally aids such person to engage in such conduct.

The aiding and abetting provision of New York law is 105.15. That provides in relevant part -- I'm sorry. This is the conspiracy, 105.15.

A person is guilty of conspiracy in the second degree when, with the intent that the conduct constituting a

Class A felony be performed, he agrees with one or more persons to engage in or cause performance of such conduct.

The murder provision, the second degree murder provision under New York State law is Section 125.25, which reads in relevant part:

A person is guilty of murder in the second degree when with the intent to cause the death of another person he causes the death of such person or a third person.

In order for the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt to a jury that the defendant committed the New York State crime of conspiracy to commit murder, the government would have to prove the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

That two or more persons knowingly entered into a conspiratorial agreement with the intention to commit the murder charged.

That the defendant knowingly became a party to the conspiratorial agreement with the intent to commit the murder charged.

And, third, that one of the conspirators acted in furtherance of the agreement to commit the murder charged.

To prove a charge of second degree murder under New York Penal Law, it would be necessary for the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant intended to kill another person.

And, second, that in accordance with that intent the defendant caused the death of the individuals named.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rizzuto, do you understand the charge against you in Count One and the elements of the crime that the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt to a jury at a trial if you were to go to trial in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. You have certain rights and I am going to discuss those rights with you now. Please listen carefully to your rights.

You have the right to plead not guilty to this charge. No one can be forced to plead guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If you plead not guilty to this charge, or persist in a plea of not guilty, you have the right under the Constitution and laws of the United States to a speedy and public trial before a jury with the assistance of your attorney.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: At any trial you would be presumed to be innocent. You would not have to prove that you were innocent. This is because under our system of laws, it is the government

that must come forward with proof that establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that you are guilty of the crime charged.

If the government failed to meet this burden of proof, the jury would have the duty to find you not guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: In the course of a trial, witnesses for the government would have to come here to court and testify in your presence. Your attorney would have the right to cross-examine these witnesses. He could raise legal objections to evidence the government sought to offer against you. He could offer evidence in your behalf if you thought there was evidence that might help you in this case.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: At a trial you would have the right to testify in your own behalf if you wished to do so. On the other hand, you could not be forced to be a witness at your trial. This is because under the Constitution and laws of the United States, no person can be compelled to be a witness against himself. If you wish to go to trial but chose not to testify, I would instruct the jury that they could not hold that against you.

Do you understand that?

OCR

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

GR

THE COURT: If instead of going to trial you plead guilty to the crime charged, and if I accept your guilty plea, you will be giving up your right to a trial and all the other rights I have just discussed. There will be no trial in this case as far as you are concerned. There will be no appeal on the question of whether you did or did not commit this crime.

The only thing you could appeal would be if you thought I did not properly follow the law in sentencing you.

Otherwise, I will simply enter a judgment of guilty based upon your plea of guilty.

If you do plead guilty, I will have to ask you certain questions about what you did in order to convince myself that you are guilty of the charge. You will have to answer my questions and acknowledge your guilt. If you do so, you will be giving up your right not to incriminate yourself.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rizzuto, are you willing to give up your right to a trial and all the other rights I have just discussed with you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I have in front of me a plea agreement in United States against Vito Rizzuto, 03 CR 1382(S-1). It is marked as Court's exhibit number one. It is dated today, May 4, 2007. It consists of five pages. I am going to hand

17 1 agreement? 2 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir, I did. 3 THE COURT: And the government has done so as well? 4 MR. ANDRES: Yes, Judge. 5 THE COURT: All right. Please return the agreement 6 to me. 7 Mr. Rizzuto, I have an important question to ask 8 Is there any other agreement that has been made to get you. 9 you to plead guilty that is not contained in this plea 10 agreement? 11 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Very well. 13 I am going to go over the statutory penalties 14 associated with this crime and the particular penalty that is 15 articulated in paragraph two. The statutory penalties for violation of 16 17 18 U.S. Code 1962(d), which is racketeering conspiracy, are as 18 follows: 19 There is no minimum term of imprisonment. 20 There is a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years. 21 The maximum supervised release term is three years. 22 That would follow any term of imprisonment. If a condition of release is violated, you could be sentenced up to one year of 23 24 imprisonment without any credit for the time you have 25 previously served in prison or the time you've previously

served on supervised release.

The maximum fine is \$250,000 or twice the gross profits of the enterprise.

There is a \$100 special assessment, which is mandatory.

Restitution will be determined by the Court and, in addition, you will be subject to removal or deportation from the United States. Since you fought extradition, I assume that that would not be a problem for you.

Do you understand the statutory penalties associated with this plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. In addition, as has been pointed out by the government, that the parties agree that pursuant to Rule 11(c)(1)(C) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, a specific sentence of ten years imprisonment, three years supervised release, and a \$100 special assessment, as well as any fine and restitution imposed consistent with the statutory penalties is an appropriate disposition of the case.

Is that your agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

Inasmuch as the Court expects that, should your allocution be satisfactory, it will agree to the 11(c)(1)(C)

disposition, which has just been articulated, I don't think it is necessary for me to go over the issue of the sentencing guidelines. The issue has been resolved through the discussion of the statute and also the bargained for disposition.

Is that agreeable?

MR. ANDRES: Yes, Judge.

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, Judge, I agree with it.

THE COURT: Very well.

Sir, in the plea agreement letter, which is dated today, May 4, 2007, you have just told me you have discussed that with your attorney and which you signed today, there is an agreement regarding your right to appeal your sentence. The agreement letter says, and I want to make sure that you understand this, by signing this agreement you agree not to appeal or in any other way challenge the sentence that I impose upon you if it is 120 months or less, which is ten years.

If I were to sentence you to more than ten years, and you believed there was a legal or other error in my doing that, you would then have a right to appeal your sentence to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you have the

GR OCR

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

20

right to appeal only if I sentence you to more than ten years? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand that even if the sentence I give you -- well, I think it is very clear, that if I sentence you to the ten years you are going to be bound by your guilty plea and not permitted to withdraw it, and you will not be able to challenge or appeal that sentence, as long as the sentence is ten years or less, as we have discussed. Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Anything else? MR. ANDRES: Only to the extent that ten years, more than ten years, as it relates to the term of imprisonment. the sentence were to be ten years and some fine, that wouldn't constitute something that's more than ten years when you are defining that term or saying sentenced to more than ten years. I think it is clear to all the parties that that relates to the term of imprisonment. THE COURT: Right. It's only that component of the sentence which is subject to the ten-year limitation. MR. MITCHELL: We understand, Your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand that?

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

Do you have any questions you would like to ask me about the charge, your rights or anything else related to this matter that may not be clear, Mr. Rizzuto?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

MR. MITCHELL: There is just one matter, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MITCHELL: As the Court can see, later on in paragraph three at page three, there is a discussion about waiver of defenses. I just want to make the record clear -- I just want the record to be clear, that it is our position and our understanding of this agreement that in the event that for some reason, and I don't foresee any, that the plea would be set aside or vacated, that Mr. Rizzuto would not waive any defenses that existed at the time that he took the plea.

So, for example, if he had a viable Statute of Limitations defense today, that if he pled -- by pleading guilty, and if in the event somehow the plea was vacated, he would not waive that Statute of Limitations defense. He would be returned, if you will, to status quo at the time he took the plea.

MR. ANDRES: Your Konor, I believe that to be the appropriate interpretation of this provision.

Just to be clear, we are not making some additional promise or anything that's outside the purposes of the agreement. But when read, the purpose -- that provision of

the plea agreement, the purpose of it is not to generate a new Statute of Limitations defense for somebody. For instance, if Mr. Rizzuto were to plead guilty today, ten years from now he can't say, or argue, I want my plea back and then, to the extent he got it, have created a Statute of Limitations problem, Statute of Limitations defense by waiting ten years and asking for his plea back.

I think what Mr. Mitchell is saying is that he believes as of today, today Mr. Rizzuto would have at least some plausible, or at least could make an argument in favor of the Statute of Limitations and that he is asking that that not be waived and, again, that's my understanding of the -- of the purpose of this agreement, if that satisfies the Court.

THE COURT: It will be waived if this plea is accepted and the sentence is executed.

MR. MITCHELL: I understand, Your Honor.

All I am saying, in the event that for some reason the plea would be vacated, he would just be returned to status quo before the plea in terms of whatever defenses he might have. I think we all agree on it.

THE COURT: I think we all agree on it.

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. MITCHELL: The one other inducement, if you will, Your Honor, is that the government has agreed that they

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
would not object to our requesting the Court that the Court
recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that Mr. Rizzuto would be
incarcerated at the facility in Ray Brook, New York.
the closest facility.
          THE COURT: Where is Ray Brook?
          MR. MITCHELL:
                        It's up near Lake Placid, I think.
          It is the closest facility to his home, Your Honor.
          THE COURT:
                      In Montreal?
          MR. MITCHELL: Yes. sir.
          THE COURT: I am familiar with the area.
understand why you would want that.
          MR. ANDRES:
                       Obviously, subject to any -- we and the
Court, to any designation or what have you by the BOP, we
obviously have no objection.
          MR. MITCHELL: The Court recommends, I understand.
          THE COURT: The Court cannot require it.
          MR. MITCHELL:
                         I understand.
          THE COURT: The Court can recommend it and, frankly,
I would certainly recommend that he be, and that any defendant
who pleads guilty or who is found guilty by a jury, be
designated to an appropriate facility as close to his family
as possible.
          MR. MITCHELL: Yes, sir.
          THE COURT:
                      Okay.
```

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

```
1
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mitchell, is there
 2
     anything that you would like me to discuss with your client in
 3
     further detail before I proceed to formal allocution?
 4
               MR. MITCHELL: No, sir.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Do you know of any reason
    why your client should not enter a plea of guilty to the
 6
 7
    charge?
 8
               MR. MITCHELL:
                             No, sir.
 9
               THE COURT: Are you aware of any viable legal
10
    defense to the charge?
11
               MR. MITCHELL: No, sir.
12
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rizzuto, are you ready
13
    to plead?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Rizzuto, how do you plead to
16
    the charge contained in Count One of the superseding
17
    indictment (S-1), guilty or not guilty?
18
              THE DEFENDANT:
                               Guilty.
19
              THE COURT: Are you making this plea of guilty
20
    voluntarily and of your own free will?
21
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: Has anyone threatened or forced you to
23
    plead guilty?
24
              THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
25
              THE COURT: Other than the agreement with the
```

government, has anyone made you any promise that caused you to 1 2 plead guilty? 3 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Other than the agreement with the 5 government, has anyone made you any promise about the sentence 6 you will receive? 7 THE DEFENDANT: No. Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Very well. 9 I would like you at this time to describe, in your 10 own words, what you did to commit the crime set forth in Count One of the indictment. 11 12 I see that you are planning to read. Please read 13 your allocution slowly --14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 15 THE COURT: -- for us. Okay? 16 Go ahead. 17 THE DEFENDANT: Between February 1, 1981 and 18 May 5, 1981, I conspired with others to conduct the affairs of 19 an association in fact enterprise through a pattern of 20 racketeering activity. Specifically, on May 5, 1981, acting 21 with others in Brooklyn, New York, I committed the

MR. ANDRES: Judge, just to fill that out a little.

THE COURT: That would be helpful.

22

23

24

25

racketeering acts of conspiracy to murder and the murder of

Alphonse Indelicato, Philip Giaccone and Dominick Trinchera.

MR. ANDRES: The association in fact is the association in fact charged in the indictment, which is the Bonanno-Massino Organized Crime Family, La Cosa Nostra.

The government would prove through the testimony of cooperating witnesses, law enforcement witnesses, surveillance evidence, forensic evidence, including the recent recovery of the bodies of Dominick Trinchera and Philip Giaccone some two to three years ago now, in Queens, as well as the recovery of the body of Alphonse Indelicato, which happened approximately a month after his murder, that 26 years and one day ago from today, Mr. Rizzuto was involved in the murder of these three men, the three captains, as you've heard: Dominick Trinchera, otherwise known as Big Trin; Philip Giaccone, Phil Lucky; and Sonny Red Indelicato.

Your Honor is actually very aware of the evidence as it pertains to these murders because, again, we have tried the Massino case in which that was at issue.

Beyond that, Judge, we'd also prove that since that time, Mr. Rizzuto has maintained an association, continued to conspire with the Bonnano Organized Crime Family, and we would in fact prove that he was a member of that enterprise.

THE COURT: You are asking me to sentence this defendant to a specific sentence which is ten years less than the maximum. You haven't told me anything about what he did. He's admitting he did something. I've got all these

defendants in this case who have admitted or have been found guilty of being involved in these murders. Yet, I am just being told he was involved.

Why should I accept a plea to a specific sentence if I don't know what he did? I don't think it is enough, frankly.

So tell me what he did. Do you know what he did? You have witnesses who are going to testify to what his role was in these murders?

MR. ANDRES: Judge, absolutely.

I don't know if you want that from the government or from the defense.

THE COURT: I want it from the defendant. What did he do?

MR. MITCHELL: Your Honor, the defendant has already stated in his allocution that he committed the racketeering acts. In fact, that he conspired to murder these individuals; and beyond that, that he did participate in the murder of those individuals.

THE COURT: That's fine. That is as far as it goes.

I am being asked to sign on to an agreement that I don't have the obligation to sign on to. Do I?

MR. MITCHELL: No, sir.

THE COURT: Then I want to know more about it. This is not some game. I am the judge. It is unacceptable.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Was he the driver? Was he one of the shooters? I sat here for weeks listening to people tell me about these murders. I still don't know what his role was. Why should I accept his plea and accept a ten-year sentence when he could be sentenced to 20 years? People have gone to jail for the rest of their lives, as a practical matter, because of their involvement in these crimes. If he's got something more to tell me, I'd like to hear it before I accept this plea. MR. MITCHELL: May I have a moment, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yes. (Pause.) MR. ANDRES: Your Honor, to the extent that we could just take a brief adjournment? THE COURT: That's fine. MR. ANDRES: We don't object to that. THE COURT: I will give you ten minutes. MR. ANDRES: Thank you, Judge. (Recess taken.) THE CLERK: United States versus Rizzuto. THE COURT: All right. MR. MITCHELL: Your Honor, what the defendant would tell the Court is that what happened on that day is that he was there. He was armed with a gun. He went in to the room and he announced that there was a holdup, and at that time the

```
1
    other coconspirators came in and shot the individuals.
 2
              THE COURT: All right. Let him tell the Court.
 3
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              That's it, Your Honor; exactly what
 4
    Mr. Mitchell says.
 5
              THE COURT:
                          All right. So what happened?
 6
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Well, I was one of the guys who was
7
    to participate in this.
                             My job was to say, "It's a hold up,"
8
    when I went in the room.
                               "So everybody stand still." This
9
    moment the other people came in and they started shooting the
10
    other guys.
11
              THE COURT: You were armed?
12
              THE DEFENDANT:
                               I was armed.
13
              THE COURT: All right.
14
              MR. ANDRES: Your Honor, just, again, I
15
    don't -- it's certainly -- in the government's view, that's
16
    more than sufficient for the purposes of an allocution.
17
    Whether or not that's something that we -- the actual proof
18
    would be at trial or not, but there is clearly --
19
                          It is his allocution, not yours.
              THE COURT:
20
              MR. ANDRES:
                            I understand.
21
              But that the government would prove that Mr. Rizzuto
22
    was in with a gun, with other people who were armed for the
23
    purpose of killing the individuals, the three captains.
24
              THE COURT: I think that's what he's just allocuted.
25
              Isn't that right, sir?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ANDRES: Yes. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Let me just point out, and Mr. Andres knows this, and it is no reflection on any of the counsel here, but I am very reluctant to take pleas under 11(c)(1)(C). I have told Mr. Andres that on a number of occasions. That's why I require that there be a fulsome allocution at the time so that at the time that I accept the plea, and therefore accept the bargained for sentence, I feel that there is a sufficient record to justify accepting a plea under those circumstances.

Do you understand that, Mr. Mitchell?

MR. MITCHELL: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ANDRES: Judge, just for the record, I am certainly aware of that. There have only been two such pleas in the more than a hundred people that have been charged in the related Bonnano cases.

THE COURT: I know. That's because I told you I didn't want to take those pleas.

MR. ANDRES: I understand.

Given this crime happened over 26 years ago, given that it gives some finality in part to the victims, it allows us to return some of the evidence at least to some of the

victims, and given the time passage, while that's no excuse, it's certainly one of the things that factors into the government's calculation as to how to dispose of the case.

THE COURT: I agree completely with the government's reasoning in doing so in this situation. I simply require more information before I make the final determination as to whether to accept an 11(c)(1)(C) plea. I think the government has done the right thing here in terms of proffering this agreement, and I have no difficulty in accepting the plea, now that I have a complete allocution.

All right.

MR. MITCHELL: Very well.

MR. ANDRES: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Based on the information you have given me, Mr. Rizzuto, I find that you are acting voluntarily, that you fully understand the charge, your rights and the consequences of your plea. There is, moreover, a factual basis for your plea. I therefore accept your plea of guilty to Count One of the indictment pursuant to the plea agreement, and specifically paragraph two of the plea agreement that requires me to sentence you to a specific sentence of ten years of imprisonment.

All right.

MR. MITCHELL: Very well.

MR. ANDRES: Your Honor, if we could ask for an

expedited PSR in this case? This case has been -- Mr. Rizzuto was indicted in 2004. All of the issues with respect to the conduct have already been resolved in past PSRs. The sentencing issues have been resolved as a result of the agreement. So what remains obviously is the interview of the defendant and some investigation with respect to financial issues and his family. But we would ask that this be expedited to the extent possible and that we set a quicker sentencing date.

That absolutely, obviously, would also facilitate any medical treatment that Mr. Rizzuto needed because I think the care tends to be more thorough, that is, the Bureau of Prisons has the ability to treat its inmates more thoroughly outside of the Metropolitan Detention Center.

MR. MITCHELL: We would join in that application, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's fine.

The only question is, how expeditiously do you think the Probation Department can prepare such a report, which I think for the most part is prepared as to the overall activities that are charged in the indictment, since there are dozens and dozens of defendants on that indictment.

MR. ANDRES: Your Honor, if we could shoot for May 25th, I'll contact the Probation today. And to the extent that this doesn't work, obviously, we will go from there. But

at least that gives us a target date, if that's acceptable to you.

MR. MITCHELL: That's acceptable to the defense.

THE COURT: Yes. May 25th, at 10:00 am. That's the day before the Memorial Day holiday so we will do it in the morning.

MR. MITCHELL: Very well, sir.

THE COURT: Please ask the Probation Department to make every effort.

Mr. Rizzuto, you will be contacted by a Probation Officer, hopefully very, very soon, in connection with an interview. Mr. Mitchell will want to be present for the interview. Please provide the information that the Probation Officer needs to complete a presentence investigation report.

The report will be provided to you and your attorney. You will have an opportunity to review it. If there is anything in the report that is in error, or if there is anything about the report that leaves out some important element of your background that would help me as to those portions of the sentencing that I still have some control over, then your attorney will provide that information to me, to the government and to the Probation Officer.

I review everything very carefully, as sentencing is my most important responsibility.

MR. ANDRES: Judge, with respect to any outstanding

medical issues or treatment, to try to facilitate for Mr. Rizzuto, I am happy to contact the Bureau of Prisons. It's a little hard for me if I don't know what the specific issues are.

I would just ask that if Mr. Mitchell could write me a letter, makes it easier for me to then forward that to the Bureau of Prisons in the absence of some judicial intervention prior to that happening, and then obviously they can reserve the right to come back to the Court if the results aren't satisfactory.

THE COURT: I would like you to do that,

Mr. Mitchell. Provide a letter to the government, with a copy
to the Court.

Based on what Mr. Rizzuto has told me, apparently there has been some identification of a spot on his lung and he needs a CAT scan to further delineate what the problem is, if it is a problem that needs some sort of surgical intervention or not, or medical intervention. The sooner he gets that particular test the better. So whatever can be done, at least in the first instance, to get him the CAT scan while he is here in the center of the medical excellence of the world, before he goes to the country, wherever that may be, and it is harder for him to get that kind of attention, from tertiary providers, the better. Let's get it done.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Judge.

MR. ANDRES: Thank you. THE COURT: Anything else from the government? MR. ANDRES: No, Judge. THE COURT: Anything else from the defense? MR. MITCHELL: No. THE COURT: Thank you. Have a nice day. Thank you, marshals. (Matter concludes.)

CM

CRR

0CR

GR

CSR